



IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re application of : **Confirmation No. 8202**
Hashime KANAZAWA et al. : Attorney Docket No. 2005_0741A
Serial No. 10/533,806 : Group Art Unit 1625
Filed May 5, 2005 : Examiner Rita J. Desai
PYRAZOLONAPHTHYRIDINE DERIVATIVES : **Mail Stop: RCE**

RESPONSE FILED CONCURRENTLY WITH RCE

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

THE COMMISSIONER IS AUTHORIZED
TO CHARGE ANY DEFICIENCY IN THE
FEES FOR THIS PAPER TO DEPOSIT
ACCOUNT NO. 23-0975

Sir:

Responsive to the Advisory Action of July 3, 2008, and together with the Request for Continued Examination submitted herewith, Applicants submit the following remarks in support of the patentability of the presently claimed invention over the disclosures of the references relied upon by the Examiner in rejecting the claims. Further and favorable reconsideration is respectfully requested in view of these remarks.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

The rejection of claims 1-6, 8-15, 18-24 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over EP '840 and US '610 is respectfully traversed.

The Examiner takes the position that the difference in activity provided in Applicants' Declaration of November 15, 2007, and discussed in the Amendment After Final Rejection, is not considered to be unexpected. Applicants respectfully disagree for the reasons set forth below.

Initially, the Examiner points to Tables 1 and 2 of EP '840. Based upon the information provided in these tables, the Examiner indicates that the variation in inhibition rate is considerable.

Applicants respectfully note that the variation between Applicants' claimed compound and the compound of the cited references was three times better. In other words, the PDE IV inhibitory efficacy of Applicants' claimed compound was three times higher than that of the reference